1/23/71

Dear Jim,

I sure hated to have to take time for this disaster some lawyers have charged Emory Brown I presume heavily to do. I am sending copies of Mitchell's letter to him, which I encourage you to study carefully (please return if I gave you one or he did) and my letter of today. I also wrote him earlier. If you do not have that letter, Bud does.

Bud asked me to write Popkin, that is the address he gave me. Would you please forward to his correct address?

Thanks for list declassified. I can't even look at now. (your 1/22, fantastic time!) No time for Lamarre or writing Levine now, either, but you might ask him if you are in touch.

I was in touch with Louis Lyon several times to do him a favor and I succeeded, with proper modesty writing that the impossible (only) sometimes takes a little longer. I ended a pending frameup against him and Voisel by getting a witness who had spoken to me earlier, knowing its potential. Typically, he had made three efforts to contact the office, knowing this, and had never been called back!. The case is now in federal court again and if Shaw again loses, they expect the case to be called a week from this Wednesday, approx.

Frame-UP: I haven't a set of BOMs, but the proofs did not have chapter headings. The table of contents indicates what they are (were-may be). That line is one I intend to feed Canale if I get to speak there. Remember, there was also a stipulation to evidence that is supposed to be part of the record. You have never had one to the best of my knowledge, and I've asked often enough.

I got Bid's Bowen mailing but wont read it until I have a few minutes to spare or until I fi ish response in 2569-70. However, the letter signed "Bill", which I take to be Turner, is more immediate, relating as it does to the Ray case. I agree withhis evaluation of the evaluation but not with his candidate. I think this means a much better and much more dependable source that Brooks. But I can be wrong. The rest also is very interesting. I wish I had more confidence in that spurce, for he has often presented things as established fact when they were not. Beeny in particular. The questions should include do Jerry or John know Beeny and was Beeny NSRP? The Robert Owens history is also interesting. I'd be inclined to doubt "clinet's" hanging arounf Williams place. There is a nut Billy Williams in the WC materials. Anderson: he might have considered that what he terms "gratuitous speculation" vs RFK and CIA was leaked to Anderson by FBI, with which he had close co nections and was favored with many leaks. The last sentence states interesting coincidences. Whether more I do not know, but it is possible that th: news pegs caused inquiry of official sources. Guess I'll have to start a "leads" file for "new evidence", and will put this there.

Response: I've finished draft (unread) on Archives unsuable, have more readily made notes on other parts, and am now putting together a complete set of relevant correspondence which will be in a separate file so I can address that. I've broken the picturesinto two files, o.e of originals. This can be quite a thing if there can be time for putting it ogether right. They misquote the law (two different ways in rwo different cases), and I have found the most serious flaws i: their work. They have given me enough to defeat them if the judge will read and be impartial. I sked Bud to ask Bon to get me a copy of the regulations. Please do not let this slip, and if you go there first, please do it and make five copies, for which I'll pay. You might also read it, quietly...On my going to DC: car to be in shop Ruesday for correction fault in relining brakes. Can't until after then. Hope you can get to the cited law(s). Brown should have sent Bud his complaint. HW